

JPRS 69728

1 September 1977

TRANSLATIONS ON EASTERN EUROPE
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS
No. 1440

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000329 148

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. JPRS 69728	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS ON EASTERN EUROPE - POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS, No. 1440		5. Report Date 1 September 1977	6.
7. Author(s)		8. Performing Organization Rept. No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		11. Contract/Grant No.	
15. Supplementary Notes		13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
		14.	
16. Abstracts The serial report contains articles on official party and government pronouncements and writings on significant domestic political developments; information on general sociological problems and developments in such areas as demography, manpower, public health and welfare, education, and mass organizations; and articles on military and civil defense, organization, theory, budgets, and hardware.			
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs <input type="checkbox"/> Albania <input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia <input type="checkbox"/> East Germany <input type="checkbox"/> Hungary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Romania <input type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia </div> <div> Propaganda Political Science Sociology Military Organizations </div> </div> 17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms 17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 15			
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 42 46
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price A 03

10
13

1 September 1977

TRANSLATIONS ON EASTERN EUROPE
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1440

CONTENTS

PAGE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

- Sabolcik: Centralism Important in Socialist Planning
(Michal Sabolcik; ZIVOT STRANY, Jul 77)..... 1
- Purpose of Bourgeois Organizers of Eurocommunism:
Anti-Sovietism
(Vladimir Peterka; NOVA MYSL, No 6)..... 10

POLAND

- Level, Structure of Higher School Graduates Examined
(Various sources, various dates)..... 26
- Need for Advanced Degrees Questioned, by Stanislaw
Bortnowski
Lack of Practical Qualifications, by Antoni
Bartkiewicz
- Michnik Book Discussed by Austrian Independent Left
Journal
(WIENER TAGEBUCH, Jul/Aug 77)..... 34

ROMANIA

- Personnel Changes in Grand National Assembly Announced
(BULETINUL OFICIAL, 9 Jul 77)..... 40
- Secretaries Elected, Released
Changes in Composition of Permanent Commissions
- Briefs
Appointment, Removal of Officials 41

SABOLCIK: CENTRALISM IMPORTANT IN SOCIALIST PLANNING

Prague ZIVOT STRANY in Czech No 14, Jul 77 pp 43-46

[Article by Michal Sabolcik: "Democratic Centralism and Management"]

[Text] The need to improve and consolidate efficiently democratic centralism in socialist economic management has become a very timely issue in view of the objectives of the Sixth Five-Year Plan as well as of the conditions for their achievement. The growth of the forces of production, the expansion of social division of labor, the increase in the scientific-technical standards, the development of new intradepartmental and intradivisional connections, the increased demands on quality and efficiency--all that requires a higher degree of knowledge, decisionmaking and control. In such conditions the importance and significance of unity in political and economic management is increasing. It is necessary to implement fully the optimum centralization and planned organization which is objectively to our advantage. Nothing can replace it in vital questions. The importance of the subjective factor and its active role in understanding the laws of the development of socialism have been enhanced.

The relations of socialist production have created conditions for an increased social activity and the people's consciousness. The fulfillment of centrally determined objectives and goals in the speed of the social development depends on the quality of labor, the activity of all organs and organizations and on their effort to make a contribution by fulfilling their own tasks to the satisfaction of society-wide needs. The application of such an immeasurable force is an effective advantage for the socialist society as well. Democratic centralism thus becomes an expression of a unified approach of the socialist society to the achievement of common objectives. The working people are participating in their formulation and in their fulfillment. Centralism unites that effort and focuses it in the most appropriate direction. Initiative, creative thinking, innovation and their practical application are indivisibly linked with that process.

The many-sided development of democratic centralism and its application have been stressed on numerous occasions already in the documents of the highest party and state organs.

Consolidation of democratic centralism in current conditions of the scientific, technological revolution was aptly characterized, for example, by L. I. Brezhnev in his report to the 25th CPSU Congress: "... Our task is to consolidate simultaneously both parts of democratic centralism. On the one hand, we must develop centralism and prevent departmental and local patriotic tendencies; on the other hand, however, it is necessary to develop the democratic elements and local initiative, to ride the highest levels of the management of secondary affairs and to provide operational flexibility in decisionmaking."¹

Intensification of the above principles remains a timely issue also in our daily economic practice. It requires a thorough application of the irreplaceable role of the central organs in the management and proposals and implementation of planned objectives for a long-term economic development, particularly when determining its national economic proportions. A practical application of democratic centralism must fulfill the requirement of which V. I. Lenin said: "... Centralism understood in a really democratic sense presupposes the possibility created for the first time in history of a full and undisturbed development not only of local attributes but also of local creativity, local initiative and various paths, ways and means for the progress to a common goal."²

It is hardly an accident that precisely in complicated political economic situations the revisionists repeatedly resorted to a frontal attack on democratic centralism, because the principles of democratic centralism, the pillars on which the management of the socialist society is based and developed, are a thorn in their flesh. In given eras of history the attacks by the revisionists and various "reformers of socialism" always intended to disorient the masses in basic questions on which building of socialism is based.

It was then and still is now necessary to fight against such tendencies. Lenin in his extensive works, particularly in his book "The State and Revolution," already criticized the anarchistic deviation as well as opportunism in the question of democratic centralism. V. I. Lenin proceeded from the fact that democratic centralism differed in principle from various forms of bourgeois democracy or bourgeois parliamentarism. For example, in his criticism of Kautsky's opportunistic views he stressed that "Kautsky did not understand in the least the difference between bourgeois parliamentarism which united democracy (not for the people) with bureaucratism (against the people) and between proletarian bureaucratism, which will be able to bring that provision to a complete end only after bureaucratism is totally eradicated and democracy for the people completely implemented."³

The experience of the international workers' movement also confirms that whenever capitalism was faced with crises and problems and whenever the revolutionary wave was rising, the bourgeoisie necessarily resorted to various forms of blunting the edge of the revolutionary masses. The attack was directed as a rule against democratic centralism, against the application of the advantages of centralism in the management and planning--which has been

made possible by socialist relations--against socialist democracy and against the party's leading role.

The situation was not any different during the crisis in our country in 1968-1969. The party leadership placed itself into an artificial contradiction to the management. Arguments were voiced in the sense that the party leadership excluded the management and vice versa and that the scientific management of society disagreed with the concept of political leadership, as if the two concepts were mutually antagonistic. The emphasis on "democratization" stripped of class contents was supposed to evoke illusions about the "Western patterns" of such democracy, etc.

Sik and his followers declared: "Everything in the area of democratization is important, but let us not forget that this involves primarily the fundamental purpose which is the removal of political impediments to a faster economic and cultural development of our country."⁴

Thus, the proponents of such views were openly assuming anti-Marxist positions. In the revisionists' theses centralism was identified with bureaucratism, with a defamation of the forms and methods of central management. In their conceptions the "reform" of socialist society presupposed a revision of the party's leading role. It was recommended that the party's leading role be reduced to its solely ideological activity.

The theory of market socialism and the destruction of the principles of democratic centralism led its proponents to a revision of the fundamental social economic relations--the ownership relations. Essentially this involved the liquidation of the societywide socialist ownership of the means of production and its replacement by an artificial control of enterprise ownership. Thereby the liquidation of the bases for central management and planning was being prepared. In their interpretation, the management exercised by supraenterprise organs was almost a "foreign element." The economic management was narrowed down to a prerogative of the enterprise sphere and within it, frequently only to a selected rank of the "elite, managers." The denial of democratic centralism also led to a denial of the economic unity of socialist producers stemming from social ownership of the means of production, [that is], from the new socialist relations.

The liquidation of the principles of democratic centralism was gradually followed by a liquidation of economic functions of the socialist state, first of all, of the centralized planned management of the economic development. The state was assigned a mere role as a kind of special information center which was supposed to predict, noncommittally, economic developments on the basis of the information on significant activities in the market.

It is obvious that, in conditions of such "economic democracy," the state would very soon cease to be the main organizer of socialist production, because it would be deprived of its organizing function in economy and in its influence on the shaping of decisive economic quotas. This follows logically from another of Sik's theses: "It must be always expected that within an

enterprise the funds will be spent on wages rather than on investments. This cannot be ever completely avoided. Nevertheless, the state should not directly intervene in the division of profits within the enterprise, neither should it intervene by its directives in the development of wages. Absolutely not. It should be left to the basic enterprise organs, to the administration and workers' council to consign their profits rationally and not to spend them all on wages"5

The practical implementation of such attitudes resulted in demands for changes in the management system based on a replacement of democratic centralism and planned management from above, of the initiative from below and of the vitality.

The Marxist-Leninist approach to the implementation of democratic centralism in management consistently follows from the interconnection of the economic management with the entire system of management in socialist society and with the role of a subject in that process. It interprets it as a dialectic expression of the action of objective conditions and of the subject in a specific era of history.

The consolidation of democratic centralism in the improvement of the management system, its effects, its tools and mechanism of connections is therefore one of constant tasks. It provides conditions and space for a purposeful action; it improves the organization and increases the fluency of the entire process of reproduction and it helps remove obstacles hampering the economic development.

As has been already mentioned, the demanding conditions of the present stage in the development have considerably raised the requirements for a comprehensive and meaningful economic management. It is indisputable that democratic centralism makes the fulfillment of such demands possible. A precondition and the foremost requirement of democratic centralism is precisely the conceptual character of the adopted measures, their thorough preparation in every relevant economic context and the analysis of their political aspects in connection with the leading strategic line. The complexity of economic relations--determined by the intensive development of social division of labor and by the progress in many aspects of the socialist living standard--requires in new conditions also an understanding of the new contents of the principle of the "leading article" which also stems from the principle of democratic centralism.

As stressed by the 14th and 15th CPCZ Congresses, our economy demands more than ever before that decisions be made with a knowledge of the perspectives for the long-term quotas and connections with the developing processes of integration. This presupposes the choice of the most efficient ways and means for the achievement of our objectives.

Speaking about the necessity to manage and plan with the knowledge of long-term perspectives, Comrade Brezhnev said before the 25th CPSU Congress: "The

15-year outlook cannot be equally detailed as the five-year plans. Its purpose is different: to determine promptly the character and the scope of the tasks facing us and to focus the forces toward their fulfillment, to become more clearly aware of potential problems and difficulties and to facilitate the planning and the fulfillment of the programs and projects surpassing the framework of the five-year plans."⁶

The realization of the long-term perspectives and the correct focus on the decisive means for their achievement are serving the socialist purposes.

Democratic centralism, however, fully pervades the process of general planning for shorter periods of time. Such plans cannot be considered as one of common tools of economic policies, either. The plan functions as the central tool for the regulation of economy as a whole and centrally balances the proportionality in the process of reproduction. The interests and objectives of socialist national economy, of the socialist society, and their implementation under given conditions are directly integrated in it. The state's national economic plan comprehensively involves every area of the economic, social and cultural development of society. "The plan must provide the pre-conditions for a unified and prompt control of economy and of all of its components and areas."⁷

The economic policy, the system of management and planning have centrally created the basic requirements and conditions for the development of the initiative and for a creative implementation and practical fulfillment of the tasks.

In his address to the Ninth All-Trade-Union Congress, Comrade Gustav Husak emphasized the tasks in the improvement of management processes and support of the socialist producers' creative initiative stemming from the principle of democratic centralism. He said: "The leading party and state organs are systematically dealing with the problems of improvement of the quality throughout the process of management and planning--from the highest organs through the ministries down to the complex state and economic mechanism. It is necessary to make the quality of its entire activity more flexible and to improve it.

Along with what must be done, as they say, "from above," more space should be given to the working people's participation in the solution of tasks; the people's initiative and sacrifice must be inspired and properly appreciated, and socialist competition must be developed."⁸

Social ownership of the means of production created a basis for the highest degree of democratization for all working people by relieving them of exploitation and by enabling the working man to develop freely. The characteristic of centralism does not contradict the working masses as in the capitalist system where the means of production are held in the hands of a small group of the ruling class. In socialist conditions they are serving the entire society to enhance the effects of social work. The realization of societywide relations

and connections makes possible the most efficient decisions ever, again for everyone's benefit. The high degree of democratism inherent in the very concept of centralism under socialism does not stem, of course, only from the "use" of its fruits. It also stems from its function in the economic management system. The kind of centralism which elevates the organs of the management to a superior position is alien to socialism. Under capitalism the managing organs exploit every kind of information so as to strengthen the relations of private capitalist ownership and to fulfill its objectives which stem therefrom. Nothing has changed if the "managerial" system is used for the management or if the entrepreneur, the owner or the board of directors acts as direct manager. Under socialism the managing sectors are a part of one managed unit to which such antagonistic inner contradiction is alien. That is already inherent in the basis of a higher type of democratism applied within the individual factors of centralization in the management.

Democratism, however, is characterized not only in that sense but also by relative independence of the managing sectors along the entire vertical line of the management in the process of reproduction. The national economic management must, therefore, be constantly strengthened along the vertical line, particularly by the competence of the intermediate factors in the management. They must carry out the tasks set up by the strategy of the economic policy. This presupposes that they be equipped for their work with rights corresponding to the extent of their responsibility for the fulfillment of tasks which they took upon themselves. Thus, the comprehensive character of the rights and obligations must be equal to the tasks stemming from the centrally set strategic line in all its parts and connections.

One part in the consolidation of the tasks of the intermediate factor in the management is the unity between the fulfillment of the tasks and the interest and material responsibility. This fully corresponds with the Leninist principle of material interest and achievement of harmony in mutual enterprise and personal interests as well as societywide interests. Democratic centralism is reflected, on the one hand, in a close link of the intermediate factor of management with the centrally set strategy and principles of the economic policy, and, on the other hand, by means of rights and obligations the intermediate factor is creating a climate for a fruitful development of the basic tasks of the plan for specific conditions of the productive economic unit, trust, concern, etc.

Thus specified, the conceptional program naturally requires that conditions for its fulfillment be created. As they are created on the national economic level, so it is necessary to create such conditions also on the level of the lower factors of management, in the organization of production. Therefore, it is important to increase the efficiency of cost accounting and, in its framework particularly, the prices and material interest, including an improvement of the entire management within the enterprise. Only thus may direct and specific tasks be determined, and may an area for the initiative and the most efficient forms and methods of its fulfillment be created under the conditions of every workroom, guild, operation, plant and enterprise.

Such an approach can help us finally solve, also, the very urgent tasks of the present time. Thus, for example, the solution of the fuel and power problems has put preferentially great demands on central measures, not only in the direction of a better realization of our potential as concerns fuel and power resources but, particularly, from the viewpoint of an intensified balance of accounts. From the center we must constantly provide conditions for the achievement of lower parameters for demands on raw materials and power in our production. In the process of a rational consumption of raw materials and power, the center may efficiently involve such comprehensive factors as science and the new technology; the promotion of new programs of production for goods requiring less power and of advantageous changes in the structure of import; a production for the purpose of expanding the testing of raw materials, etc. Along with conditions thus created, however, it is necessary to involve also collectives of the enterprises in the fulfillment of such objectives, to apply the working people's initiative and creative forces in the framework of rational decisionmaking in the enterprise area. The creation of such specific conditions utilizing familiarity with immediate problems in the operation provides a basis which increases the efficiency and the effect of social work.

Let us take another example. We must overcome the declining efficiency performance of basic production funds. There is still the problem of the exploitation of our capacities. In order to overcome it, the enthusiasm and effort of individual producers are not enough. An improvement in the utilization of capacities requires a comprehensive program. Most of all, we must balance the demands, which will mean a more thorough utilization of our capacities from the point of view of material security, which will develop with a more thorough use. What kind of demands will develop as concerns the need of workers, including availability of professionally qualified workers? New investments may be permitted only according to the degree to which capacities have been utilized. As we can see, many of those problems surpass the range of the enterprise. Therefore, they must be solved on the level of the central, managing organs. They also are frequently causing complications in the availability of additional investments, demands on foreign trade, etc.

To put it succinctly, it is necessary to learn how to improve and raise the standard of our work within broader economic and technological contexts through the application of all the advantages of relative independence in management and decisionmaking in the area of enterprises. This does not have to become immediately a condition for economizing in every place of work; this may become a precondition for a rational approach which will provide systematic and, thus, also more permanent savings. On the other hand, as a rule, the highest degree of economy in enterprises also leads to the highest degree of economy in general.

With new conditions the demands on the people's work and on socialist competition also have changed. What we need is rational thinking, proposals and their fulfillment on how to deal best in every place of work with the tasks

of quality and efficiency prescribed by the plan and how it may be possible on the basis of the created conditions to overcome the bottlenecks in production without achieving that change by means of considerable investments, import, or, as the case may be, by further increased demands on the workers. We do not want to purchase efficiency of one factor in production for losses and lack of efficiency in other factors. On the contrary, we are striving to improve the process of production first of all by the most efficient utilization of the funds of production which are available to us.

At the plenary session of the Central Committee of the CPCS in February 1972 Comrade Husak said the following words which are still timely: "... In the competition we are interested primarily in bringing the lagging enterprises up to the level of the most efficient ones, in broadening the progressive experience, in the growing force of the examples set by the leading collectives and work teams of socialist labor and in evaluating, also, their educational impact in the consolidation of labor discipline and organization and in the workers' consciousness"⁹

Our working people are learning every day that our progress is ensured. The bold perspectives of building of socialism is accompanied also by increased demands. We have never concealed that fact, just as we have said openly that the socialist system of production offers us objectively superior conditions to those which exist in capitalism. Democratic centralism pervades all of our activities. It does not oppose them now and never has opposed them; on the contrary, one of our great accomplishments is that all of us are participating in determining the objectives in building of socialism, in the search for the means to achieve them and in their fulfillment. On that basis the efficiency of the managing and planning systems must be increased; the central, balancing and cross-section links in the plan must be strengthened, and the demands on the tools of management must be increased in order to reach higher quality, efficiency and creative initiative. Consolidation of democratic centralism, together with material and moral involvement, will help fulfill the basic political tasks proclaimed by the 15th congress of the party.

FOOTNOTES

1. "25th CPSU Congress; Documents and Materials", Svoboda, 1976, p 55.
2. V. I. Lenin, "Works", vol 27, p 202.
3. V. I. Lenin, "Selected Works", v. II, Svoboda, Prague, 1950, p 203.
4. O. Sik, "Mzdy-ceny-demokracie" [Wages--Prices--Democracy], PRACE, 31 May 1968.
5. Ibid.
6. "25th CPSU Congress", Svoboda, Prague, pp 37, 38.

7. "Opatreni ke zdokonalovani soustavy planoviteho rizeni k 1. 1. 1976"
[Measures for Improvement of the Planned Management System as of
1 January 1976], supplement of HOSPODARSKE NOVINY No 42/1975.
8. The Ninth All Trade Union Congress, address by G. Husak, RUDE PRAVO,
26 May 1977.
9. G. Husak, "Sbornik materialu z jednani plena UV KSC 17.-18. 2. 1972 a
plena UV KSS 22.-23. 2. 1972" [Anthology of Material from the Meeting
of the CPCZ Central Committee Plenum on 17-18 February 1972 and from
the CPSL Central Committee Plenum on 22-23 February 1972], p 26.

9004

CSO: 2400

PURPOSE OF BOURGEOIS ORGANIZERS OF EUROCOMMUNISM: ANTI-SOVIETISM

Prague NOVA MYSL in Czech No 6 (approved for publication on 10 May 77)
pp 57-77

[Article by Vladimir Peterka, journalist, Prague: "Europe and Communism"]

[Excerpt] We will not find any two socialist countries which took the same approach to the process of working out solutions to the problems of socialist revolutionary transformations after World War II. Of course, the paths which they followed did display some common or similar characteristics. They did enforce the leading role of the communist party and the working class, and they did take advantage of favorable international conditions. In particular, there was one fundamental principle which they all observed, i.e., they combined the utilization of concrete and specific conditions with the consistent acknowledgement and application of the universal Marxist-Leninist principles governing the revolutionary transformation of society.

In the world today, and especially in Europe, new conditions have emerged that have a bearing on the continuing revolutionary struggle of the working class and all working people and on the work of the communist and workers parties.

Most importantly, a new balance of power has been created which is clearly more conducive to the interests of peace and social progress, especially in Europe. The world socialist system has become a decisive factor in the course of world affairs, a factor which is having an intensive impact on all world events. The several dozen newly independent countries which sprang up out of the ruins of the imperialist colonial empires are making an objective contribution to the further weakening of imperialism and to the strengthening of the interests of peace and social progress. The communist and workers movement has been endowed with new strength and vigor. The general crisis of capitalism is becoming profoundly worse. The process encompassing the relaxation of international tensions has become a determining factor in the development of international relations.

Any one of these factors by itself would be capable of exercising a major influence on the conditions that determine the class struggle in the world

today. But their cumulative impact represents a tremendous social force which is literally creating a new situation in terms of the struggle of the working class and all working people against the rule of the capitalist monopolies and for the socialist transformation of society.

Given this situation, who in fact are the targets of those polemicists according to whom it is allegedly necessary to "repudiate" dogmatic concepts which strive to see to it that the forms of socialism achieved in some countries are reproduced exactly everywhere else? Where are the people, the parties, the social forces that would base their actions on such naive and anti-Marxist ideas? Is it not myopic and foolish to claim that we here in Czechoslovakia, for example, would want to instruct others in how to follow our example or even try to force others to follow the paths of the revolutionary transformation of society that were effective in Czechoslovakia, but would be hard to follow under different specific conditions?

Yes, it is true that Czechoslovak communists stress again and again that the tremendous wealth of experience gained by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was the first party to successfully lead the working class to victory in a socialist revolution, represents, objectively speaking, the greatest, the most comprehensive, and the most concentrated source of knowledge and learning which cannot be dispensed with by anyone who seriously wants to wage a struggle for the achievement of socialism. The CPCZ has always had something to learn from this experience, and at the same time it has also taken lessons from the experience of other parties. In this connection we might at least mention the lessons learned from the experiences of the popular front struggles in France and Spain. And, by the same token, we are firmly convinced that our own experience has just as many valuable lessons to offer, lessons which can be generalized and followed in the work of other parties; this experience can teach other parties how to profit from our positive achievements and show them how to avoid our mistakes and shortcomings.

It is a logical and self-evident fact that the work of any communist or workers party can be said to be genuinely effective only when and if in conjunction with utilizing the whole wealth of experience accumulated in previous historical stages it is also consistently based on a thorough analysis of existing conditions and only if it makes full use of all new elements, favorable circumstances and factors, including both those that are universal and valid under contemporary international conditions, at least in terms of all the European capitalist countries, and also those specific factors which vary from country to country.

Thus, it is entirely reasonable to deduce from this that if the revolutionary transformation of society in those countries which embarked on this path after World War II and after the historic victory of the Soviet Union over Hitlerite fascism displayed both general and particular characteristics, then it is all the more reasonable to assume that things cannot be otherwise at the present time. To the extent that universal conditions, especially international conditions, have a common impact, then there also

must be certain common characteristics that describe the path to the revolutionary transformation of society in any given country. At the same time, of course, the process of differentiation has reached such a point that the concrete and specific conditions that obtain in any given country are so varied that it is utterly impossible for any one party to mechanically adopt the tactics of another party. For this reason the documentary records of the communist and workers movement emphasize that every party is responsible for working out its own political line on a completely independent and autonomous basis in response to the social, economic, and political conditions and national attributes of their own countries.

None of this, of course, amounts to any new and earthshaking revelation. The sole point to be made in repeating these things is that contemporary experience simply confirms the validity of the Leninist doctrine and substantiates the long-since established and practically verified dialectic which describes the process of the revolutionary struggle for the socialist transformation of society. In every country the process of building socialism reflects the fundamental general laws of the revolutionary approach and also the concrete realities of time and place. "Socialism as such," socialism cast in some kind of prefabricated abstract mold has never existed anywhere. Socialism always takes on a specific national shape that is appropriate to a given country and to the struggle being waged by its people. There is not one classical scholar of Marxism-Leninism who ever "prescribed" or who was even capable of "prescribing" some kind of "medical prescription," according to which any drugstore in the world would be capable of "producing" socialism. The building of socialism represents an immensely complex and inexhaustibly rich process dedicated to the construction of a new social order. And nothing could be more alien to Marxism-Leninism than to artificially simplify and debase the manifold aspects of this living, organic process.

At the same time, of course, all experience clearly confirms that there is no such thing, nor could there be any such thing as various "different national socialisms," which would not be linked together by the main general laws governing social development. After all, every social order in the history of mankind has created a great panoply of institutional forms and configurations, but all of them have always held certain basic features in common. Things cannot be otherwise even in the case of the socialist social order. The scientific teachings of Marxism-Leninism have made it possible to recognize these common characteristics and also to recognize the general principles and requirements of the revolutionary approach to social change. It is possible to ignore these common factors, but the consequences of doing so will be just as costly as if one were to ignore any of the other objectively valid general laws of social development.

It is true that during the present historical stage as well, under conditions which are in many ways new and different from those which prevailed in earlier decades, the dialectics of the revolutionary struggle are characterized by their own objective general laws. The clearly distinguishable process of differentiation which is taking place in Europe and

everywhere else in the world is opening up far-reaching opportunities that make it possible to take advantage of the concrete specificities of a given country at a given point in time and, on this basis, to develop relatively new tactical instruments and methods of practical political work. However, whatever may be the specific features of a given situation or the given conditions under which a struggle is taking place, this does not diminish the need to acknowledge and abide by the general Marxist-Leninist laws governing the revolutionary approach to social change. To ignore these general laws and to give absolute priority to specific characteristics is tantamount to not seeing the forest for the trees.

The social base of the anti-imperialist struggle is constantly expanding in Europe and elsewhere in the world. This fact is opening up new opportunities, especially with regard to the question of which social forces constitute allies of the working class. It can be truthfully said that today the working class has different allies than did the Russian workers at the time of their revolution. However, in the present stage of historical development, as the opportunities which arise in this connection in terms of the policies of the communist and workers parties become ever greater and broader, there is a need for correspondingly greater flexibility in terms of policy toward political allies. And at the same time this lends correspondingly greater urgency to Lenin's teachings on how this policy must be based on the proposition that the general level of proletarian class-consciousness, revolutionary spirit, and capacity for struggle and winning victory will always be increased and never reduced.

The policies of international imperialism and, especially in Western Europe, the intensively growing pressure of the USA and the multinational monopolies naturally combine to accentuate the importance of policy code words that emphasize the defense of national interests and patriotism in the work of communist parties. This is entirely justified. Communists take pride in affirming that they are the most outstanding patriots in their countries, the most consistent fighters for the interests of their nations. But as slogans calling for the defense of national interests become a more and more prominent feature in the policies of the communist and workers parties, it becomes a more and more urgent fact of life itself that there is an objective and categorical need for unity in the struggle to protect national and international interests and goals. At a time when international imperialism and the forces of international reaction are working together more and more closely in an effort to coordinate their anti-socialist, anti-communist activities, when the objective process of the internationalization of social life is becoming increasingly more intensive, it is confirmed as a fact of everyday life, as was pointed out at the 15th Congress of the CPCZ, "that unity, class and international solidarity are the most effective weapons of the revolutionary forces in the struggle for social and national liberation. Consequently, we consider proletarian internationalism to be one of the main principles of our party."

By resorting to all available means the bourgeoisie is trying to blackmail and intimidate the communist parties. It is spreading all kinds of arrant

nonsense about how proletarian internationalism is a concept dedicated, supposedly, to the restoration of a single organizational center and designed to insure the subordination of the individual parties. Everyday its communication media harangue communists with questions such as: "You say you are independent? You say you are fighting to protect national interests? You'll have to prove it!" And the only way they can allegedly prove this is by categorically renouncing proletarian internationalism and by associating themselves with outbursts of bourgeois invective directed against the socialist countries.

Attempts using various means to prove "the objective necessity" of some kind of qualitatively new "European" communism are backed up by a long tradition. The bourgeoisie has always supported and encouraged the conclusions arrived at by rightist revisionists of the most diverse stripes who claim that "Russian-style" communism is perhaps suitable for Asiatic societies or, let us say, even for East Europe, but it is not at all suitable for the West. And so if nowadays we hear arguments about how "primitive socialism" is completely unsuitable for modern, advanced capitalist countries and about how it is necessary to build up a "separate identity" that is completely different from socialism as practiced in other countries, then such statements are by no means original. Nor is there anything new about the fact that the various conceptions of "Eurocommunism" are presently trying to convince the bourgeoisie, primarily the inhabitants of the capitalist countries, that socialism for the advanced European countries is supposedly a completely unacceptable alternative. It is paradoxical and at the same time typical that the radio station of the American intelligence service looks for the "specific meaning" of Eurocommunism in the fact that the common stand of some of the parties is purportedly supposed to be based on "a restored sense of vision that hearkens back to Marx's ideas on the common evolution of Western Europe toward socialism."

Socialism Under "New Conditions"

In the case of Western Europe or at least in the case of some of its countries what then is supposed to be the source of these "qualitatively and completely new" characteristics which predestine it to the advent of some entirely new type of communism? We find several hints that will help us to answer this question in Western writings. Let us look first at those which at first glance might appear to give one an impression of objectivity.

It is said that what we are primarily concerned with here are industrially advanced countries which have a rich democratic tradition, traditionally powerful mass labor movements, strong and mature communist parties, and a highly diversified and multifaceted social structure. For the time being let us leave aside the objections which immediately come to mind as far as the validity of this description is concerned precisely with regard to certain of those countries which the bourgeoisie proclaim to be the focal points of Eurocommunism. But a reader in this country is at once struck

by another coincidence. Namely, the fact is that all of these characteristics fit Czechoslovakia to a tee! Of course, the bourgeoisie is also aware of this coincidence. This is, after all, the reason why the forces of reaction were so enraged over the crushing defeat suffered by those who attempted to engineer a counterrevolutionary coup in Czechoslovakia. In their anger they went so far as to say--let us quote DIE WELT at least one more time--that, "the Prague Spring and its brutal culmination marked the close of the 20-year cycle, the outlines of which also began to take shape in Prague in 1948." In any event, they cannot reconcile themselves to the fact that the attempts to change the very nature of the communist party from within, to covertly undermine socialist society, and to transform Czechoslovakia from a loyal ally of the Soviet Union into a salient of international imperialism directed against the Soviet Union ended in complete failure. They cannot and will not reconcile themselves to the fact that it was in Czechoslovakia that certain "progressivists," advocates of socialism with a human face were recently unmasked as the agents and obedient followers of orders issued by the most reactionary centers of international imperialism.

But let us now return to the matter of "new conditions of historical development."

Prewar Czechoslovakia was indeed one of the classic bourgeois democratic countries, and it took pride in the fact that its foremost leader was "a great philosopher and humanist." The communist party was a legal political party for most of the time; it was a strong party, which possessed both the capability and skills necessary in order to properly take advantage of the various opportunities afforded by parliamentary infighting. The social democrats also had a strong party. But the Czechoslovak people were well aware--just as the people of the advanced capitalist countries are now well aware--of the dark side of the social democrats in terms of their bias in favor of the wealthy classes. The people were witnesses to the shooting of workers, mass unemployment, hunger and poverty; they experienced the need to emigrate in order to find jobs to support themselves, and--again as in the case of the modern advanced capitalist countries--they saw areas of extreme poverty in the midst of an industrially developed and relatively affluent country. They experienced the blessings of "the security of the rule of law," under which to exclaim in public "long live the Soviet Union!" was in violation of the Law on the Protection of the Republic and was punished by imprisonment. They experienced the treachery of the ruling class of the great bourgeoisie and also the bitter disillusionment inspired by the policies of the social democrats.

Was the socialist state supposed to carry on this democratic tradition? Could the working class assimilate this kind of democracy? Could the communist party put up with this? The socialist social order did in fact assimilate everything that was positive in this tradition, everything that the people had achieved in the past through the shedding of their own blood and later on in the struggles with the exploiting classes that claimed so many victims. However, this entire "democratic tradition" had to be turned

upside down and re-established on a firm foundation, a new class foundation. Only socialism was able to give real substance to the concept of democracy. Democracy for the affluent had to be transformed into democracy for the workers, farmers, and intelligentsia, for the broadest possible spectrum of the working people. This democracy is surviving and flourishing today, primarily in the form of those institutions which no capitalist society has ever recognized and still does not recognize. These institutions are manifested in the genuine participation of the working people in the administration of all aspects of social and national political life, in the fact that the broad ranks of the people are actively participating not only by taking part in the quest for and in the creation of the most effective means of social development, but also by being the principal force involved in the fulfillment of established goals. This participation is developing in the form of the unusually wide-ranging and manifold activities of the trade unions, the scope of whose authority would be utterly unimaginable in the capitalist countries. It is also developing as a result of similar contributions being made by the most diverse kinds of cooperatives that exist in our society--running the gamut from unified agricultural cooperatives to producers' and consumers' cooperatives, in comparison with which the "cooperative democracy" of the capitalist countries is only a minor historical precursor.

The socialist social system offers literally unlimited opportunities conducive to its further growth, perfection, enrichment, and expansion. The prospects for the further improvement and intensification of the work performed by the national committees are but one example of these limitless opportunities.

At the same time we by no means make a secret of the fact that the criminal plots against socialism being hatched by the imperialist world force us to take certain steps in the interest of protecting socialist society and its citizens. Indeed, it is not coincidental that the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe makes the promotion of personal contacts between citizens of European countries directly contingent upon the further advancement of the process of the relaxation of international tensions. The promotion of the cause of socialist democracy does not and never will have anything in common with the abuse of various slogans concerning "democracy" and "freedom" aimed against socialism. The Czechoslovak people, who made such great sacrifices in order to build a socialist society, will never grant anyone the "right" to fight against socialism with impunity, to strive for the elimination of socialist democracy under the banner of abstract liberties or "human rights." We will never permit anyone to interfere in our internal affairs or to try to teach us how we should be promoting the cause of democracy.

Bourgeois Czechoslovakia was also a country with a richly diversified social structure. The fact that there were several dozen political parties is just one example of this diversity. Even the individual nations and ethnic groups had their "own" parties. And the bourgeoisie magnanimously left room for the

operation of the most diverse kinds of interest groups and other organizations, provided of course that they did not violate the bourgeois rules of law and order. They regarded this as a useful way in which to diffuse popular interests into manageable splinter groups and to draw the attention of the people away from the political struggle against the dictatorship of the great bourgeoisie.

The socialist society that was established in Czechoslovakia assimilated all of the positive aspects of the country's richly diversified social structure. In addition to the communist party, which through the general course of events acquired the entirely lawful and natural position as the leading force in society, other political parties are still functioning, including those which are philosophically opposed to Marxism-Leninism. The National Front has proven itself to be an effective institution in our political system. Its extensive organizational network does everything necessary to permit the assertion of the most diverse interests, activities, and initiatives of the citizenry, to give the public a say in the administration of public affairs and at the same time to insure that they make a combined effort on behalf of the cause of socialist construction.

Many people in the West, who are constantly under the influence of bourgeois disinformation campaigns, are quite surprised to learn, for example, that in Czechoslovakia there are 18 legally established churches, which have every opportunity to freely conduct their religious ceremonies. At the present time in the Czech Socialist Republic, which has a longer tradition in this area, there are 106 active general public organizations, societies, associations, unions, and units of a political, professional, interest-group, or scholarly nature, ranging from the Revolutionary Trade Unions Movement with its several million members to societies with a few hundred members. Again in the CSR there are 116 active musical, literary, scientific, employees, charitable and other clubs. Counting their various local branches, there are more than 150 such clubs. In addition to nationwide organizations, there are 79 Slovak organizations, unions, societies, associations, and so on active in the Slovak Socialist Republic.

Is this supposed to be indicative of the barren, homogenous, and monotone structure of socialist society in Czechoslovakia? Of course, in this respect too it was not possible for socialism to mechanically assimilate the heritage of capitalism. Socialism had to create the kinds of conditions under which this entire richly varied mosaic of diverse organizations would serve the true interests and needs of the people and contribute to the development of society as a whole so that through them the working people would be able to play an active role in the development of society, to control that development, and to imbue that development not only with their labor, but also with their will, hearts, and minds.

The last thing we want to do is to teach anyone else how to lead their lives. In reality, though, it sometimes happens that only life itself will have anything to teach those who embark on it burdened by various

kinds of illusions. However, our own experience speaks for itself very clearly. Namely, Czechoslovakia is in fact one of those typically industrially advanced countries which even in the past had a long-standing democratic tradition, a powerful mass labor movement, a legal and strong communist party, and a richly diversified social structure. These factors and these traditions were capable of playing and in most cases did play a positive role in the socialist transformation of society and in its continuing socialist development. But they could play this role only on the condition that our society would endow them with new substance and a new social significance, on the condition that what once served the interests of the bourgeoisie was placed into the service of the working class and all the working people and was established on the new class foundations of socialist society.

The Goals of the Adversary

We have already shown how this entire highly extensive bourgeois bibliography on the subject of "Eurocommunism" is permeated by the effort to saddle the communist and workers parties with the responsibility for the origination of this concept. In spite of this, however, as the saying goes, the cat is out of the bag. And, so, when all is said and done, the real purpose of all these properly convoluted analyses and biased studies of "Eurocommunism", in all its brazenness, stares us right in the face, namely, the class interests of the monopolistic bourgeoisie.

What then is the promise of "Eurocommunism" according to its true authors? What concrete goals do they have in mind with their wide-ranging attempts to impose this concept on at least some of the communist and workers parties of the advanced capitalist countries?

It would be naive to assume that we will only find paeans to "Eurocommunism" in bourgeois commentaries on this subject. In the specific attitudes taken by individual representatives of the bourgeoisie we encounter both applause and encouragement and, on the other hand, suspicion and indictments. This divergent reaction both reflects genuinely existing differences of opinion in the ranks of the bourgeoisie, while at the same time fulfilling a function that amounts to a sort of division of labor. We well know that within the ranks of the modern monopolistic bourgeoisie there are certain circles which possess a realistic awareness of the contemporary international balance of power and, hence, of their limited opportunities, and so they tend to resort to the use of those methods and forms of struggle which reflect an appropriate degree of cautiousness. On the other hand, the extreme reactionary forces of imperialism, circles tied to the military-industrial complex, the forces of international Zionism, most representatives of the news media business, and the traditional sworn anti-communists, approach the idea of Eurocommunism in the spirit of the old Trojan saying "timeo Danaos at dona ferrentes" [beware of Greeks bearing gifts], hence, according to this point of view, "you can only trust communists to be communists." Thus, for example, the American CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR of 5 January [1977]

raises the question as to whether or not Eurocommunism might be "Moscow's Trojan horse." Former American secretary of defense Rumsfeld takes a very straightforward position: "The entry of communists into the governments of the NATO member countries is incompatible with the security interests of the USA." And it supposedly does not matter if this takes place under the banner of "Eurocommunism," as if to say this is not true communism. In one section of its series referred to above the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE recalls the view of some observers that, "Eurocommunism is only camouflage used by the Italian communists to deceive the electorate before it comes to power." This view is echoed in a similar manner by the verdict of the West German minister of foreign affairs, Mr Genscher, who has acquired a certain amount of fame as a result of his definition of Eurocommunism as "the process of creeping into power in one's bedroom slippers."

These contradictions are, of course, at most dialectical in nature. This is already obvious in light of the statements made by the American newspaper INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, which remarks that, some "American politicians would rather renounce and defame Eurocommunism than try to use it or gain influence over a new situation. Many Europeans believe that they are passing up a golden opportunity." The class interests at issue here, then, are entirely congruent. The name of the game is to fight communism. The only question is whether this struggle should be waged on an open front or should an effort be made to subvert and neutralize communism through the use of "subtle methods." The observations of Springer's DIE WELT go even further. Nowhere is it said, according to DIE WELT, that the future path of "Eurocommunism" must "run along a straight line without any digressions. New developments may give Eurocommunism an unexpected new force of its own." And DIE WELT says in conclusion: "Only time itself can hasten the process leading toward the clarification of ambiguities and toward a final decision as to the democratic fidelity of Eurocommunism, which is nevertheless an essential hypothesis."

And so now the tactics of international imperialism are placed completely out into the open. The bourgeoisie is aware of the fact that the idea of Eurocommunism did not achieve what it promised. And DIE WELT does not cling to the illusory belief that all of the targets of this bourgeois ideological pressure were actually overcome by it. The future path, then, does not follow a course that is without "digressions." But it is still necessary to take action, systematic and purposeful action, for only time can "hasten the process" so that the real goals of international imperialism can be achieved and so that the "democratic fidelity of Eurocommunism" can be insured. In the meantime, though, as is noted by the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, "Eurocommunism continues to more of a myth than a reality." In the struggle to achieve its goals international imperialism combines both methods: the method of praise and encouragement and the method of suspicion and constraint. Herein lies the ultimate sense of the whole bourgeois indictment that, allegedly, the policies of some of the West European communist parties are devoted to "the systematic erosion of capitalist society" and of the conclusions to the effect that it is "dangerous to give communists access to the reins of power

in Western Europe." This is the old tactic of the carrot and the stick. On the one hand, the bourgeoisie uses all of their communications media to popularize every utterance, every word which could be interpreted as being indicative of an "inclination toward Eurocommunism." At the same time, however, a constant effort is being made to "hasten the process leading toward the clarification of ambiguities."

An active role in all of this is also being played by certain representatives of the right wing of the social democratic movement. Of course, these people do not even bother to hide the fact that they are our adversaries when it comes to questions concerning the struggle to win over the masses and also ideological questions. The Austrian chancellor and president of the Austrian Socialist Party, Bruno Kreisky, never passes up an opportunity to stress the fact that he puts no trust in Eurocommunism. And his every statement on this subject is at the same time filled with challenges and conditions which the leadership of certain communist parties must meet before they can gain the trust of Mr Kreisky.

We will get back later on to a discussion of this role as played by certain West European social democrats, but for now we must first respond to the question as to what are the concrete goals of the authors and instigators of Eurocommunism.

If we take the time to read through all of the stacks of bourgeois studies and articles on Eurocommunism, we will without a doubt find that all of this material is tied together by one central demand, namely, the call for the disengagement of the West European communist and workers parties from their international ties with the parties in the socialist countries, above all including the CPSU. The French weekly L'EXPRESS, in a discussion of the various types of Eurocommunism in an article published in June of last year, states that, "the break with Moscow is the only feature that they all share in common." In its issue of 11 March 1977 the British paper ECONOMIST puts it clearly and succinctly: "What the coiners of this new term really want to say is that the Soviet model is being abandoned." Even the headline of this article openly proclaims: "The Road to Eurocommunism Goes Further Than Moscow." Likewise, according to Voice of America, Washington views the adoption of "independent policies vis-a-vis the Soviet Union" as being the most important element of Eurocommunism. And, according to the American magazine NEWSWEEK, the essence of this phenomenon--as described in what is supposedly "Marxist jargon"--is seen to lie in "the need to repudiate the international proletarian movement."

Thus, anti-Sovietism is the basic policy line of the bourgeois organizers of "Eurocommunism" and the main objective of their efforts. This is anti-Sovietism not for the sake of inflicting harm on the Soviet Union, but rather for the sake of the fact that it was, is, and always will be the most important and most concentrated form of anti-communism, for the sake of the fact that, as comrade Gustav Husak pointed out at the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers Parties, "it is a weapon that is constantly used

by the enemy to fight against our entire movement and against each and every party."

It is understandable that the anti-Soviet plans and goals of the bourgeois organizers of Eurocommunism also fit hand in glove with other speculations about how Eurocommunism might be used within the context of a policy aimed at "the erosion of socialist society." Thus, the London programs of the BBC from around the end of December hopefully proclaim in the jargon of bourgeois propaganda that, "Eurocommunism might also jeopardize Soviet political and military domination in East Europe." Similarly, in its study the NEUE ZUERICHER ZEITUNG stresses that, "a western-style, liberalized national communism might have explosive effects in occupied East Europe."

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is the principal foreign policy tool of the worldwide policy of international imperialism. So, it is no wonder that in the view of international imperialism the attitude toward NATO is one of the crucial criteria governing its attitude toward the communist and workers parties. American political leaders in particular make no secret of the fact that they will judge the maturity of the "Eurocommunist influence" primarily according to the degree to which it coincides with NATO plans and goals and subordinates itself to NATO discipline. There is also another version to American statements about how communists should not be allowed to join the governments of the NATO member countries: we will let you join these governments only when we are certain that this will not jeopardize NATO interests.

This demand is very closely related to the primary demand, i.e., anti-Sovietism. An issue of the WASHINGTON POST from the end of June of last year expressed this demand in unusually candid terms: "The more West European communists can be separated from Moscow and drawn into the western mainstream, the better things will be for the entire Atlantic community." The importance that is attached to this question is also attested to by the fact that a 3-day symposium on "defense and security in Europe", which was held in Paris at the beginning of February of this year on the initiative of the Foundation for National Defense Studies and the Center for Foreign Policy Studies, among other key issues on the agenda, devoted special attention to the question of "Eurocommunism." This symposium gave top priority to dealing with the major question as to how will West European governments with leftist members respond in the event of war. A member of the French Socialist Party, at least according to the 27 February 1977 issue of the weekly LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR, supposedly answered this question without hesitation by saying that, "In a crisis situation a leftist government would show its complete loyalty by lining up on the side of its allies and fulfilling its responsibilities as dictated by the provisions of the treaty." And this newspaper concludes its remarks by saying that, "in a short period of time the loyalty and allegiance of the communist parties to the Atlantic community could become the mainstay of the entire structure of the western alliance." Solely on the basis of this evidence it is already obvious that the main rationale of these imperialist bourgeois pressures is not "merely" a function of the ideological struggle,

but also of great power interests and the effort to shift the balance of power in favor of the forces of imperialism. Those communist parties which have declared themselves to be opposed to the war plans of NATO and the feverish armament campaigns of the capitalist powers are supposed to be co-opted into these plans and goals.

There is another basic characteristic of the plans and goals of the bourgeois organizers of Eurocommunism which is also entirely explicit. In an article written by the Japanese journalist Takashi Oka and published in the 5 January 1977 issue of the American newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR Eurocommunism is defined as "a reformist version of radical Marxism, which, in contrast to Leninism, places emphasis on"--and the article goes on to enumerate a number of more or less classical reformist demands. The main emphasis is placed on the phrase "in contrast to Leninism." Thus, the break with Leninism is cited as another criterion and goal. An issue of the American magazine NEWSWEEK published at the end of November of last year also states that when "we look at it in its most sympathetic light(!), Eurocommunism implies a repudiation of major dogmas."

There is nothing at all strange about the fact that Leninism is the target of such concentrated attacks on the part of the bourgeoisie. For, after all, it is Leninism which provides fundamental and specific answers to the questions of socialist revolution and the construction of socialism. The bourgeoisie and its servants are not content with the concessions that have been gained on the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat and are bringing increased pressure to bear in order to gain further concessions. For example, in an interview granted to the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL the leader of the Austrian Socialist Party, Bruno Kreisky, proclaimed that, "the European communist parties must do more than just renounce the principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat if they want to prove that they are in favor of democracy." And at the end of May of last year the leader of the Swedish Social Democratic Labor Party, Olaf Palme, stated that, "in order to overcome their isolation they will have to renounce the principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarian internationalism, and democratic centralism." Simply put, as the same gentleman said on a previous occasion, they must "renounce the cardinal points of communist ideology."

The demands put forth by the bourgeoisie calling for the rejection of democratic centralism are becoming increasingly more insistent and firm. The NEWSWEEK article quoted above stresses that Eurocommunism "is undertaking a major revision of the bolshevist concept of democratic centralism which governs the activities of communist parties throughout the world." The bourgeoisie is simply being as emphatic as it can be in serving notice on the communist and workers parties that "mere" concessions on theory are not enough, that it is also necessary to abolish the basic organizational and political principles that govern the structure of communist parties.

It is not even necessary to ask why it is they are doing this. They are doing it for the simple reason that they want the communist party to cease to be a communist party.

The "social-democratization of the communist parties" is a very popular idea among the bourgeois organizers of Eurocommunist tendencies. Several years ago the bulletin of the Italian ministry of foreign affairs published an article written for the benefit of communists in which it was said that it will not be possible to trust them until they adopt a political stand that is similar to that taken by the German social democrats--in 1914. The American periodical NEWSWEEK states that the communists, in the wake of the aforementioned "repudiation of major dogmas," are "beginning to look more and more like the social democrats." Bruno Kreisky also observes that if one is to believe the things that have been said about Eurocommunism, then "by their own admission, they are no longer communist parties." One of the founders of the Socialist International, the president of the Norwegian Labor Party, Reiull Steen, boasts that "the Eurocommunists are beginning to act more and more like good, pragmatic social democrats." And in his great vision of the future of the social democratic movement he predicted that, "in 5 or 10 years the socialists belonging to the various different parties, including those who today call themselves socialists, social democrats, or communists, will agree on a common platform without regard for their historical antagonisms." And NEWSWEEK characteristically adds: "And this will be the socialist democratic triumph not of Karl Marx, but of Eduard Bernstein." It should only be added that at least on this one issue NEWSWEEK takes a more realistic view. Namely, when it goes on to say: "Perhaps in this case the wish is the father of the thought."

There is really no need to add anything else to these specifically stated goals of the bourgeoisie and its allies in the ranks of the right wing of the social democratic movement. They speak for themselves. They confirm that the concept of Eurocommunism is designed to be used against the communist parties, with a view to their neutralization and the destruction of their foundations. Eurocommunism is one of the ideological tools which is supposed to make it possible for monopoly capitalism to protect its position in places where other means are ineffective. This is a tool which is designed to help international imperialism to alter the balance of power in situations where neither, economic power, political influence, or weaponry are equal to the task.

Communism Will be Victorious

All of these efforts, attacks, and pressures of the class enemy should not be underestimated. Capitalism has suffered a number of major, decisive defeats. However, it has also learned some lessons from its forced retreat, and it is continuing to fight against us in a much more coordinated fashion than ever before and with a correspondingly greater expenditure of energy and resources. Thus, we are going through a period in which the ideological struggle in the world is becoming sharply more acute, or one might even go so far as to say that it is becoming frantically more intense. Our adversaries are focusing most of their energies and resources on those areas where the position of imperialism is most threatened and where, from their viewpoint, they perceive more vulnerable points in the positions taken by our side. In

response to the fact that there has been a major expansion in the role played by the communist and workers movement in recent years and a major increase in the political influence exercised in its own countries by certain parties the class enemy has greatly increased its activities along these lines. It is taking advantage of every possible opportunity to deepen the philosophical differences that exist within the movement, to sow the seeds of discord among the fraternal parties, and to outmaneuver and neutralize the growing influence of the communist parties in some of the West European countries.

The only way in which we can respond to this challenge is by demonstrating even greater solidarity and steadfastness in the defense of the interests of the communist and workers movement and in the struggle against imperialism. At the conference of European communist and workers parties held in Berlin at the end of June 1976 and attended by 29 communist and workers parties it was stressed that all of the participating parties "reject any policy or world view which is in essence dedicated to the subordination of the working class to the capitalist system." The participating communist parties placed great emphasis on the importance of internationalist solidarity, which at the present time cannot be underestimated and cannot be "replaced by anything else." In the final document issued by the conference the participating communist parties stress that "they will promote their internationalist, comradely, and voluntary cooperation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideals of Marx, Engels, and Lenin while at the same time strictly observing the principles of the equal rights and absolute independence of every party, noninterference in internal affairs, and respect for the freedom to choose different courses of action in the struggle for progressive social change and for socialism. The struggle for socialism in one country and the responsibility of every party before its own working class and people is an integral part of the mutual solidarity of the working people of all countries and of all progressive movements and peoples joined in the struggle for freedom and the consolidation of independence, for democracy, socialism, and world peace."

Through their work and everyday efforts Czechoslovak communists and all of the Czechoslovak people are making a dedicated contribution not only to the building of an advanced socialist society in their own country, but also to furthering the international interests and to fulfilling the needs of the international communist and workers movement. We are firmly convinced that new successes and new victories will also be achieved in the capitalist countries of Europe. We firmly believe that in France as well as in Italy, the FRG, Portugal, Spain and other countries as time goes on the working class, under the leadership of communists, will find the most effective ways which, in accordance with the interests of the great majority of the people, will lead to the socialist transformation of their societies. And if our class adversaries ask us why we are so certain of this, we can give them a clear and simple answer. Namely, our certainty is a product of the scientific teachings of Marxist-Leninist theory and of the great successes achieved by socialism in the Soviet Union, in Czechoslovakia, and in the other fraternal socialist countries. And, most importantly, our certainty is derived from

actual developments in the capitalist world. The depth of the crisis which has befallen all of the capitalist countries and every aspect of their national life and the inability of capitalism to resolve the key problems of the future constitute irrefutable proof of the fact that this social system has no future. The people and the working class led by the communists will find strength enough to overcome these problems, to abolish capitalism, and build a new socialist society.

11813

CSO: 2400

POLAND

LEVEL, STRUCTURE OF HIGHER SCHOOL GRADUATES EXAMINED

Need for Advanced Degrees Questioned

Warsaw ZYCIE LITERACKIE in Polish 3 Jul 77 pp 1, 12

[Article by Stanislaw Bortnowski: "How Many Students Do We Need?"]

[Excerpts] We have not avoided errors by developing secondary education and especially higher education. I believe we have completely unnecessarily convinced the young people that higher education belongs to them for nothing, as it were, without their additional efforts, and that it is equal to their daily bread and, if we do not give this bread to every young person in the future, we shall be unjust and discriminating toward those who were born for a diploma.

It has seemed this way because our school system, fascinated by teaching efficiency, has introduced every kind of pressure to promote every lazy and mediocre student from class to class, from academic year to academic year. We still regard selection and failure as a social calamity, while it should be an element of natural selection. Teachers are told that they should not give bad marks, and docents that no one should fail in examinations. Weaklings are supported, sustained, pulled up and shoved up, just so they can get their certificate, and so that those who have been accepted for higher studies can receive their diplomas.

In this way the diploma has become more important in our country than the profession. Work after receiving a diploma or the suitability of the specialists for the national economy are much less important questions. "Study, my child, we do not want to wrong you. Finish the technical institute instead of the basic school, and after the technical school go on to higher studies, because a technician does not count for very much." The result is that a technician or a skilled workman on the middle level really does not mean much in our country, so that we have 3 times more engineers by title than in the most developed industrial countries of the world.

We have also educated an immense number of Polish literary specialists, historians, biologists, geographers, artists (musicians play in saloons in the West) and many, many other masters of science and art, for whom there is no work now or soon will not be.

Among the anomalies of our education on a higher level must be mentioned the following facts: Anyone who does not succeed in his studies or does not pass the preliminary examination, very often takes advantage of the privileges of a correspondent student after a year or two of work. In this way studies for working people, which were to serve as an equalizer of social opportunities, in fact help the less intellectually gifted. Often the choice of a specialty in correspondence studies is not in accord with the needs of the factories, which are filled with higher cadres of a given specialty or really require some other specialty, precisely the studies which the candidate does not want to or is unable to take. Instead of helping him by guiding him toward alternating studies, we stop dead in the face of this form of assuring cadres of a higher education for the more distant provinces. The Resolution on planned employment of graduates is not working efficiently, funded scholarships have gone bankrupt, the country does not have apartments, alumni of the AGH [Academy of Mining and Metallurgy], of the AR [Agricultural Academy] and of polytechnical institutes do not wish to go into production, and sit in their white lab-coats in laboratories, design offices or research support. In the end the inhabitants of the large cities prefer work as a most miserable official, if only they do not have to leave the metropolis, and that is the reality causing the strain where more rational and more controlled supervision of studies would be able to eliminate the conflict. Unfortunately the "Statistical Yearbook" has not yet analyzed this situation, and we do not know what degree of advantage Poland has in highly educated personnel in comparison with other European countries, or whether our rich aspirations are not a case of unconcerned wastefulness.

Social development requires painful revisions of prognoses. It seems that the time has really come to put a stop to the aspirations of young people, often not justified by their talents. Quite a few of the candidates for higher institutions should never compete for courses. Instead of troubling ourselves with the frustrations of the failures, let us rather be troubled by the situation on the labor market. Further uncontrolled educational ambitions can lead to a crisis in social systems. Instead of living on the seventh mountain and in the seventh forest, and believing in the fairytale that very soon studies will be for all those who wish to study a little, let us look facts in the face. The truth is as follows: Most necessary for us today and tomorrow will be all qualified workmen, craftsmen and laborers with a secondary vocational education.

How do we imagine the society of the future will be? Certainly it will not be able to function normally without bakers, joiners, chauffeurs, shunters, traffic dispatchers, printers, bookbinders, woodworkers, fieldworkers, tile-layers, masons, plasterers, guards, mechanics, varnishers, welders,

painters, hotel attendants and porters, waiters, conductors, dishwashers, cooks, clerks, street salesmen, machinists and many more in unending procession. Enterprises are looking for these kinds of workers and will continue to look for them, although varied civic services require the performance of simple activities which cannot be replaced by automats or robots. Anyway, we do not see them anywhere at present.

A few more years of forced master's degrees, a few more consultation points, and perhaps a few more higher institutions and new departments, and even in the poorest province the labor market will not need, for example, masters of construction, to say nothing of female masters (for construction is a field of women), while masters of sewage will be necessary for a long time yet. In short we have also filled the slots for physicians, but it will be necessary to close the hospitals without nurses and ward attendants.

Alarmed by the future, one journalist has quite seriously proposed the introduction of women's service in hospitals and health centers on the pattern of military service for men. Even large plants are threatened. An example is the Foundry named for Lenin. Today the factory employs 4.65 percent of workers with a higher education, 17.8 percent with a secondary education and 31.2 percent with an elementary education. The proportions at the top are suitable, perhaps a little over estimated. After all, it would be difficult not to yield to varied kinds of pressure and, for example, not put into a slot an engineer whose father has worked in the combine for a long time. An increase of only 0.4 percent is anticipated in this group of workers by 1980, with 3.6 percent in the group of workers with a secondary education and 8.2 percent in the group with a vocational education.

In Huta, in spite of the hopes of laymen, the relationship between automation and the degree of staff qualification will operate only to an insignificant extent. As an exception the delivery of charges to blast furnaces has been modernized, but in the raw material systems of Huta not much has changed, neither in our country nor in the most technically advanced countries of the world. Therefore we must expect that in time there will be a polarization of qualifications among the workers in Huta. At one pole will be those with higher and secondary educations, and at the other workers who are almost completely unskilled, performing simple but clumsy activities, tearing down, removing and building up! The Anglo-Saxons do not want to do this in the American foundries, and not even Poles work in the steel mills in Chicago. The foundry business in the United States employs Puerto Ricans and the foundries in West Germany employ Greeks and Turks. In our country even young men from the country do not want to be boshmen, steel spreaders or pig iron founders, nor do they wish to be switchmen in transportation. For this reason the problem of unskilled workers will be important in the foundry ministry for a long time.

What kind of workers do smaller, more typical factories primarily want? Press advertisements state that they want gas welders, stevedores, tinsmiths, stone and tile layers and women for publishing work. The majority of factories do not know their future, and when an investment is made, they do not know which technology is involved. The number of specialists which must be hired depends on the choice of technology. Shall they hire metallurgists, founders, or perhaps experts in energy and electronic technicians? All staff planning for more than 3-5 years belongs, unfortunately, to what I would call compulsory statistics. It is subject to the whim of the ministries, but afterwards the graduates, the demand for whom was only fictitious, cannot even be kicked into the factory. Investments are born and come to an end. We have built the North Port, petroleum refineries, the Katowice Foundry, but the cellulose factory in Kwidzyn has spanned two 5-year periods. The trained experts have to be sent elsewhere. The result of this is that very accurate formation of needs for graduates of higher institutions to 1985 or 1995 will not come true, so we must be content with estimates.

How do these estimates look? Let us assume that the number of students in arbitrary numbers must continue to increase as it has. In the 1965-1975 decade we had 216,000 students, including 131,000 full-time students. Consequently we must have as many as 634,000 students in 1985 and 900,000 in 1995. This corresponds to 414,000 full-time students in 1985 and 545,000 in 1995. The report of experts is still more liberal in its predictions. According to variation I 25 percent of the class will be studying in Poland in 1985, 35 percent in 1995 and up to 40 percent in the year 2000. In variation II mention is made of 26 percent of the class, including vocational studies, in 2000, with 16 percent in master's studies.

In my opinion only the last figure, 16 percent of the class of the total number of students, may be realistic, while the other prophecies are simply naive. After all, there were 3,473,000 million young people aged 19-23 in 1975 (10 percent of the class was studying at the time). In 1985 this figure will drop to 2,633,000 and in 1995 to 2,531,000. These demographic data are not at all hypothetical, because the children who will be 20 years old in 1995 have already been born.

The demographic level forces us to be very prudent in guiding young people toward studies. If we do not hinder the ambitions of secondary school graduates, we shall face a production and service disaster. The situation on the labor market today points this up clearly. Large percentages of workers with low qualifications and of laborers, craftsmen and farmers with a secondary education will be necessary. The 10-year education gives them a certificate, but does not really justify their becoming students. Barriers obstructing the flow of the less talented youth to the gates of higher institutions of learning are necessary. Obviously these should not be class and geographic barriers. On the contrary, we must aim at finding talents in all environments and developing alternating studies which should be aided by workers with innovative talents, teachers with several years of experience, and gmina and small town administrations.

This year we will accept about 70,000 secondary school graduates in higher institutions. Some 150,000 or possibly 160,000 young people have expressed a desire to continue their studies. How many of them will really devote themselves to their studies? How many wish to study only because terminal studies lead to fine future?

I would advise getting rid of the euphoric dreams about a future society as a society of masters. I was informed in the Ministry of Higher Education that the number of places for students in the current 5-year period will not be changed. This is a very valid decision, and reality will probably compel us to continue the policy of minimization which, in the coming drop, will also mean minimization in numbers relative to an increase in students.

What I am writing about can seem ironic. But the irony in the progress of education is emphasized in a report issued by UNESCO in 1975, "Education in Development," a continuation of the reknowned "Education for the Future." The experts ask if it is possible to free education from the tyranny of the market place. Is it possible not to trust in the necessity of continued educational development? After all, rejection of this truth means a loss of confidence in progress.

"The world crisis in education is a crisis in development." Mankind wishes to develop and grow, and he must be aided in this self-realization. But how? Is the motto "Act more effectively for yourself and for others" sufficient as an argument in the conflict between individual rights and the necessity of the social order?

These are great questions swollen by peripheral abstraction, but life teaches that we must also be concerned with trifles. For example, should a waitress, brakeman, charwoman and baker have to have an advanced education in 1995? I answer no, but if we were to dissipate our capabilities on the level of benefits, then perhaps the waitress will be a historian, the brakeman a metallurgist, the charwoman a pedagogue, and there will not be any bakers at all.

You readers may ask who will then bake bread. Here the point is that I do not know, and in concern about our daily bread and about the normal division of roles in a society clothed in civilization, I propose a serious discussion on the expansion of institutions of higher education. Let the quantity turn into quality, and after some years we can again think about quantity.

Lack of Practical Qualifications

Warsaw SZTANDAR MŁODYCH in Polish 23 Jun 77 p 5

[Article by Antoni Bartkiewicz: "It Is Most Difficult to Break Habits"]

[Text] From the assumptions of the socioeconomic development of the country a simultaneous result is that a pertinent growth in work productivity will be the motive force of the assumed development and of further

progress, and will be a basis for realizing our aspirations, both society-wide and individual. This is an obvious matter. In this context the problem of the place and role of science in connection with industry, and the problem of technological progress seem to us to be the result of scientific activity.

There is only one answer, somewhat simplified, to the question of how to measure the effect of scientific and technological progress and of all scientific research progress: It must primarily be measured by the results found in increasing work productivity. This is simple and clear. Yes, it is, but the realization of these assumptions embodies an immense range of problems which cannot be settled by simple activities, whether they are only of an administrative nature or of some other type. The complexity of the problem of the comprehensive development and approach to a desired condition, not to mention an ideal one, requires time and the consolidation of the efforts of all interested parties. In addition in many cases it requires a change of thought, and especially developing the habit of thinking according to economic categories, and of thinking in a total and prospective manner. This is because the essence of the matter, when industrial production itself is involved, lies in defining the reasonable proportion of satisfaction of needs of the day and an attempt to answer the question of what the same industry wants to provide the national economy with after 5, 10, or 15 years.

For this reason the role of the scientific research background, of research and development, and of all novelties and innovations should be as important as production itself. However, an awareness of this and only an awareness, is much too little. This is because too often we can see a persistent unwillingness on the part of industry to adopt any novelties, any technical or technological innovations, any creative measures or common reaction to the proposals of scientists. This is an unfortunate phenomena occurring as often as there is a lack of common understanding of joint interests. Obviously I am speaking here of individual phenomena. The policy of the state and the concrete activities of individual ministries in a comprehensive way solve the matter of technological progress. However, it is no less difficult not to notice disquieting and negative phenomena. It is impossible not to see the lack of understanding, the conflict of interests and the misunderstandings occurring in contacts on a comprehensive scale between science and technology.

After all, we run across the reproaches of some scientific workers stating that industry does not want to buy their thoughts and their elaborations. However, it is difficult to be surprised about the industries which do not wish to buy designs often devoid of any knowledge of production organization, technological level, commercially available materials, factual needs of industry and social needs. This is exactly why the stipulated proposals are unworkable and are not suited for practical introduction. There is a lack of understanding when people wish to put into production everything that someone has dreamed up or thought up. If we are speaking today about

large and modern industry and about large scale production, it is because this is a matter of economic accounting. Industry cannot be interested in the production of an object in amounts of only 10 pieces, even though it may be very necessary. It is not able to do this because it would cost too much.

This type of proposal, as well as claims addressed to industry, comes from scientific circles which are not associated with scientific and research industrial institutions.

Why Industry Does Not Buy

Attempts to understand the situation and to break the impasse still occurring often in contacts between science and industry (science outside of research and scientific industrial laboratories) are slowly achieving success. It is enough to recall all of the positive signs of cooperation, agreements signed (for example, between the Ministry of Machine Engineering Industry and the Wroclaw or Rzeszow Polytechnical Institutes), or the participation of scientific laboratories subject to the Ministry of Science, Higher Education and Technology in conducting state programs or solving critical problems.

However, we cannot forget that the tasks of higher education for the national economy are different from the tasks levied on scientific industrial institutions. These functions are defined unambiguously: provision today and tomorrow for future highly skilled cadres, the reproduction of their own scientific cadres, and basic research carried out for the purpose of meeting these tasks.

Should we be surprised that industry does not wish to buy designs which do not have a real economic basis? Is it possible not to acknowledge the correctness of industry when it reproaches higher education for the low level of preparation of engineers, who do not have the slightest idea about production when they have finished their studies?

After all, modernness, service life, the quality of technical and technological measures and the values of production depend on Polish engineers and technologists. But the institutions of higher education, as is often emphasized, do not prepare good technologists. Why not? The academic teachers themselves are not familiar with production. It is estimated that 80 percent of the scientific staff lecturing on technology and tools have not spent even a few days in a producing plant. This is a matter which requires an urgent and thorough solution.

Another matter is the preparation of cadres for future years. After all, we cannot train engineers just for today. That is too little. Even today technology is changing, as it certainly is in the Polish electro-machine industry, every 5 to 7 years. Unfortunately institutions of higher education are not able to constantly meet these tasks.

Joint Goals

What has been said above is not intended as an accusation. It is intended to serve only as an outline to produce awareness of one thing: a joint and single technical policy. It is obvious that we can speak about a technical policy as such. But this cannot help being a very complex matter, since it involves the affairs mentioned above of lack of understanding and mutual claims between industry and science. It appears that these are the results of a lack of common understanding and a meeting of partners on the level of achieving common goals. Previous positive and fruitful undertakings realized through joint efforts confirm this.

Of course there have often been Polish engineers and Polish technicians who have fit into the perfect organization. This is simply the fact that Poles cope. We have many examples of people giving everything they have and of solving a given problem with wonderful results. This, then, is a matter of the organization of our economy, science, supply system, service and comprehensive approach to problems which the country has to solve. Our country has many such problems to solve, because no one else will solve them. These are questions of food, energy supplies, construction, transportation and so forth. Let us compare them with Italy: a chemical industry based on sulfur, tourism, the Fiat and its specialized machinery. Likewise Switzerland is noted for precision mechanics, medicine and electromedicine, and international services.

We have considerably more of these tasks in Poland. Who is to decide them? Which should have priority? Certainly those existing in the year 2000 and later will have to be solved now and kept being solved. Such a comprehensive solution to problems is primarily served by government programs (about which B. Pratzner wrote in SZTANDAR MŁODYCH of 16 June), and following them there must be research on definite critical problems. These very data on the priorities dictate the technical policy of our country.

However, analyzing the research carried out and the situation in which the research is found and is carried out, listening intently to the opinion of the researchers themselves and following publicity on this subject leads to the conclusion that in some cases instead of the formulation "what is to be done," too often the suggestions and promptings are "how is it to be done." It seems that the "what" should be formulated. The "how" is a matter of the scientific research background, of the pertinent planning and economic cells and of those who organize concrete research. Formulation at the very beginning, at the very start of "what" is equal to formulating a technical policy. And such goals have been outlined for us. The fact is to perceive the community of goals, which can eliminate misunderstandings and inconsistency, which do not serve anything or anyone. The main point is to realize these set goals.

6806

CSO: 2600

POLAND

MICHNIK BOOK DISCUSSED BY AUSTRIAN INDEPENDENT LEFT JOURNAL

Vienna WIENER TAGEBUCH in German No 7/8 Jul/Aug 77 pp 40-41

[Article by "mp": "Poland: The Church and the Intellectuals"]

[Text] Ever since December 1975, when a number of intellectuals and artists protested against the planned changes in the constitution--the so-called "letter of the 59" was soon followed by further letters and memoranda--, calm has not been restored in Poland. The workers' riots of 1976 gave added impetus to the protest movement; above all, they led to a bridging of the traditional rift between workers and intellectuals. The Polish church has more or less kept aloof from this struggle between the workers and intellectuals and the party bureaucracy. To be sure, quite a few well-known priests and committed Catholics are in the van of the civil rights movement and the episcopate did not hesitate to condemn the reprisals made upon the workers and to demand that the rights due all citizens be observed regardless of the citizens' political persuasion; but Cardinal Wyszyński avoided any real clash with the anyhow weakened party leadership, although he would have had ample opportunity (one need only recall here the state security organs' attempt to circulate fake sermons allegedly delivered by the Cardinal).

The Church is definitely not unsympathetic towards most of the intellectuals criticizing the regime; nevertheless, it has adopted an observant and possibly even somewhat suspicious attitude, and it is above all the intellectuals who must be blamed for this. At least, this is the opinion advanced in a book by the young civil rights proponent Adam Michnik; this work--"Kosciol, Lewica, Dialog" (Church, Left, Dialogue)--was published a short time ago by "Instytut Literacki," a publishing house of the Polish emigration, and is dedicated to the memory of the late poet Antoni Slonimski, whom Michnik had served as secretary. The book was published in May and in the same month its author was arrested in Poland. It is the first extensive work by the

young historian (God knows what made "PROFIL" magazine--in its issue of 24 May--call him "one of the most important historians of his country") and it tackles a complex and above all very explosive subject: Michnik tries to portray and analyze the often quite stormy development of the relations between Church and state (better: between episcopate and party leadership) and also between the Church and the leftist intellectuals from 1945 up to the present.

There is hardly any other country, where the starting positions for peaceful coexistence and for an open dialogue between the Church and the State were so unfavorable as in Poland. During the inter-war period, there were practically no contacts between the Catholic Church and the Communists: there was total conflict. The Church was undoubtedly one of the principal supports of reaction--if Michnik contents himself here with innuendoes, this must be seen as a tactical maneuver: after all, he tries to come to an understanding with the Church.

But the long-time parliamentary representative of the Catholic Znak group, Jerzy Zawieyski, who certainly cannot be suspected of harboring any anticlerical prejudices, writes about the reactionary attitude adopted by the Church during the interwar period: "Even though it is painful, one must admit that the Church with its representatives, officials and priests was the biggest obstacle for us on the road towards Catholicism and faith. We equated Catholicism with anti-Semitism, fanaticism and generally speaking, with any reactionary and barbarous manifestation."

During the years of the German occupation, the Catholic Church was brutally persecuted. The German fascists knew very well that already during the partitions of Poland the Catholic religion and the Church as an institution had played an important role in regard to the preservation of national consciousness (of the partitioning powers, only Austria was Catholic; this was an important factor in its meeting with greater acceptance). But the fact that both the Church and the Communists had been suppressed was not sufficient a basis for reconciliation after 1944/45. During the occupation, the Church had sided with the underground army loyal to London. The bands of underground fighters who after the end of the war battled the Communists until the beginning of the 1950's, considered themselves defenders of Catholicism, regardless of the attitude of the Church. Moreover, after the liberation the Church protested against all reforms. In regard to this policy, Tadeusz Mazowiecki, who subsequently became chief editor of WIEZ, the Catholic monthly, makes the following comment: "From an historical point of view, it cannot be denied that during the first postwar years, when the most important reforms were carried out such, as the nationalization of industry or the agricultural reforms,

the Church adopted an unsympathetic, if not hostile, attitude toward the reforms. This attitude also manifests a resistance against the regime, which the Church considered to be imposed and atheist, and a goodly share of social conservatism."

In this connection, it appears somewhat exaggerated when Michnik defends the episcopate's attacks against various reforms such as the introduction of civil marriage and divorce, because the reforms "represented an element of totalitarian policies." He holds that by supporting the progressive process of secularization the liberal and leftist intellectuals became "an unwitting tool of the totalitarian power, which through an extraneous mandate and with outside help worked to the detriment of the Polish nation."

But it was not until 1948, when the "Polish road" to socialism had been declared a heresy and when Gomulka had been replaced by the Stalinist Bierut, that the struggle against the Catholic Church increased in severity. The party warned the Church that it "would not tolerate any subversive activities"—a reference to the Church's warnings against "materialist trends." The Church countered with an appeal to the faithful, calling to mind the "millennial historic Concordat between the Catholic Church and the Polish nation." Side by side with administrative measures—the Caritas organization, for example, which had been supported above all by Poles in the United States, was "nationalized" in 1950—there were several attempts to destroy the Church from within. Here Michnik mentions the establishment of the PAX Society, which had its origin in the journal DZIS I JUTRO (Today and Tomorrow), and the organizing of all priests who had participated in the anti-fascist resistance movement in a separate group within the ZBOWID veterans' association, which won dubious fame during the anti-Semitic campaign of 1968.

In another section, the author deals at greater length with the PAX Society, which "from the very beginning was conceived as an agency by its Soviet protectors." At first, however, the leadership succeeded in convincing many critical intellectuals, who were frustrated by the Church's rigid attitude toward the problem of social reforms, that they wanted to build a socialism with a Catholic conscience. One of these intellectuals was Tadeusz Mazowiecki, who along with a number of other critical intellectuals finally turned his back on PAX in 1955. After this "purge," PAX has never again been suspected of progressive tendencies: In 1956, the Society supported the Stalinist Natolin group and in 1968, Moczar's anti-intellectual and anti-Semitic "partisans." A few weeks ago, it was a PAX deputy, who in the parliament accused the civil rights proponents of letting themselves be directed by "anti-Polish and cosmopolitan centers."

In February 1953, the State Decree on the "establishment, filling and abolition of church offices," which was practically equivalent to the total subjugation of the Church, led to the final break, which was intensified by the trial of Bishop Czeslaw Kaczmarek. When Cardinal Wyszynski protested against the trial, which was based on false evidence, he himself was arrested, banished from Warsaw and incarcerated. Michnik calls to mind that during the Stalinist period it was almost impossible for the intellectuals--no matter for what motive--to protest against the persecution of the Church. The only possible form of protest was silence.

The Polish October of 1956 led to a normalization of relations--the outward manifestation was Wyszynski's release and return to Warsaw. Moreover, in December the Decree of 1953 was repealed. But Michnik justly points out that if the protagonists of the Polish October voiced any protest against the Stalinist reprisals against the Church, they did so very timidly; many even regarded the reduction of the influence of the Church as one of the few positive achievements of the period of "errors and distortions." Likewise, with regard to the very frank discussion at the Eighth Plenary Session of the Central Committee, one searches in vain for a critical assessment of the persecution of the Church. Besides, the relatively good relationship between the episcopate and the party leadership was as short-lived as the thaw itself. This circumstance is used by Michnik in support of his thesis that any intensification of the repressive policy toward the Church was always accompanied by a progressive restriction of democratic liberties in general; consequently, the non-Catholic leftist intellectuals--Michnik calls them the "lay left"--should join in the defense of the Church.

In 1957 the journal PO PROSTU, the organ of the critical young intelligentsia, was outlawed. This led to unrest and a number of prominent writers, including Jerzy Andrzejewski, Mieczyslaw Jastrun, Adam Wazyk and Jan Kott, withdrew from the party. In 1958 the journal NOWA KULTURA was placed under the guardianship of the party and a number of writers, including Marian Brandys, Wiktor Woroszylski and Tadeusz Konwicki, withdrew in protest from the editorial staff collective. At present, most of them are active in the civil rights movement. In 1963, the 13th Central Committee Plenum proclaims the campaign against "antagonist tendencies" in culture and art. The intellectuals counter the repression with protests. "The policy pursued by the authorities was opposed in various ways by Maria Dabrowska, Antoni Slonimski, Maria Ossowska, Tadeusz Kotarbinski, Edward Lipinski, Leopold Infeld, Leszek Kolakowski, Wlodzimierz Brus and others." But none of the individuals mentioned protested against the simultaneous

repression of the Church.

They also kept silence, when at the end of 1965 and at the beginning of 1966 there broke out a full-blown smear campaign, triggered by the Polish bishops' letter to the German bishops, which on account of its conciliatory tone was denounced as a betrayal of national interests. According to Michnik, the progressive intellectuals **did not** protest against the verbal abuse--often reminiscent of Stalinist methods--, because they "did not see the true motive for the unleashing of nationalist sentiments and attacks against the only independent institution of the country." The regime was not concerned with the privileges of the Church--they had been nonexistent for a long time--but rather with the continuation of its totalitarian policy.

Two years later, the intellectuals and students were accused of betraying national interests. Michnik foregoes a detailed description of the student riots of March 1968, in which he himself had taken a leading part. But he documents at length the positive attitude of the episcopate, which unequivocally called for a greater measure of understanding for the students and which laid the blame for the brutal excesses on the police forces. In his Maundy Thursday sermon, Cardinal Wyszyński also opposed--albeit obliquely--the anti-Semitic smear campaign. More outspoken were the delegates of the Znak group, who denounced the brutality of the militia and ORMÓ (volunteer reserve militia)--this resulted in their being accused of being stooges of Zionist subversion.

Since 1968, the "lay left's" attitude toward the Church has undergone noticeable change. "The intellectuals have stopped fighting the Church and propagating the official atheism." More and more intellectuals regard the Church as the only power capable of keeping open certain intellectual sanctuaries. In reply to the question why he was writing for Catholic journals of all periodicals, the poet Antoni Slonimski said: "Before the war, the Church was backward and it was Communism which proclaimed progressive ideals; today it is the other way around."

However, Michnik wants to avoid producing the impression that the leftist intellectuals are drawing closer and closer to the Church, because they feel that only the Church can offer them protection from the suffocating embrace by the totalitarian bureaucracy; rather, he holds that the explanation lies in the attitude of the Church itself, which has come to understand that its principal task is not to defend itself and its privileges, but the people and their rights. The polarization of forces has led to a situation in Poland, in which even non-Catholic Marxist intellectuals can see only two roads, two positions--

a third road appears to be impossible. "The true enemy of the lay left is not the Church, but totalitarianism; the central problem is the conflict between totalitarian power and the entire Polish society which is deprived of its rights. In this fight against totalitarianism, the Church plays a part the significance of which can hardly be overrated," writes Michnik, who thus takes a position identical with that of Leszek Kolakowski.

Michnik's book, which impresses the reader on the strength of its valuable documentation of the hitherto neglected struggle between the Church and the party, confirms one impression: In this struggle between the party bureaucracy and the civil rights movement, there has emerged one great victor: the Catholic Church. Without entering the struggle, it has proved to be a power against the will of which nobody in Poland can rule. Through its open and critical attitude, it has practically "integrated" all the critical intellectuals without bringing on in this process an open conflict with the regime.

8760

CSO: 2300

ROMANIA

PERSONNEL CHANGES IN GRAND NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ANNOUNCED

Secretaries Elected, Released

Bucharest BULETINUL OFICIAL in Romanian Part I No 65, 9 Jul 77 p 11

[Excerpts] Inasmuch as some deputies, secretaries of the Grand National Assembly have received new assignments, the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania has decided:

1. To relieve deputies Constantin Babalau and Vasile Potop of their positions as secretaries of the Grand National Assembly.
2. To elect deputies Nicolae Constantin and Ion Sirbu secretaries of the Grand National Assembly.

Changes in Composition of Permanent Commissions

Bucharest BULETINUL OFICIAL in Romanian Part I No 65, 9 Jul 77 p 12

[Excerpts] Inasmuch as some deputies, members of the permanent commissions of the Grand National Assembly, have received new assignments, the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania has decided:

To modify the composition of some permanent commissions of the Grand National Assembly as follows:

1. In the Constitution and Legal Commission
 - To release deputy Dumitru Bejan.
 - To elect deputy Emil Nicolcioiu.
2. In the Commission for Industry and Economic-Financial Activity
 - To release deputies Trandafir Cocarla, Nicolae Constantin, and Ioachim Moga.
 - To elect deputies Stela Balan, Valer Gabrian, and Ion Staicu.
3. In the Commission for Agriculture, Silviculture, and Water Management
 - To release deputy Gheorghe Petrescu.
 - To elect deputy Aldea Militaru.
4. In the Commission for Education, Science, and Culture
 - To release deputy Ion Sirbu.
 - To elect deputy Maria Uta.
5. In the Commission for Peoples Councils and State Administration
 - To release deputy Petre Blajovici.
 - To elect deputy Valeria Stanescu.
6. In the Commission for Defense Problems
 - To release deputy Ion Stanescu.
 - To elect deputy Mihai Marina.

ROMANIA

BRIEFS

APPOINTMENT, REMOVAL OF OFFICIALS--The President of the Socialist Republic of Romania decrees that Comrade Lucian Dragut is released from his position as deputy chairman of the Central Council for Worker Control of Economic and Social Activity and appointed to the position of first deputy chairman of the Central Council for Worker Control of Economic and Social Activity. Comrade Cornel Iuga is appointed deputy chairman of the Central Council for Worker Control of Economic and Social Activity. Comrade Vintila Rotaru is relieved of his position of state secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture and the Food Industry and appointed deputy minister of agriculture and the food industry. Comrade Emilian Mihai is appointed deputy chairman of the administrative council of the Romanian Foreign Trade Bank. [Excerpts] [Bucharest BULETINUL OFICIAL in Romanian Part I No 71, 17 Jul 77 p 3] The President of the Socialist Republic of Romania decrees that Comrade Alexandru Oprea is relieved of his position as vice president of the National Bank of the Socialist Republic of Romania and that Comrade Nicolae Anghel is relieved of his position as deputy chairman of the administrative council of the Romanian Foreign Trade Bank. [Excerpts] [Bucharest BULETINUL OFICIAL in Romanian Part I No 66, 11 Jul 77 p 7]

CSO: 2700

END